## REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10-12, 14-17 and 20-24 are pending in the present application.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 10-12, 14-17 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Crater et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 6,201,996, hereinafter "Crater") in view of Fleischman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,507,847, hereinafter "Fleischman").

As mentioned in the Amendment dated July 28, 2009, one aspect of the invention relates to web-based monitoring and control of distributed installations, where a web client can interchange data/information with web servers in respective distributed installation using a web client's integration layer. Referring to Fig. 3 of the present application, the web client 1 communicates with the web servers 2.1, 2.2, . . . 2.n of the distributed installations 3.1, 3.2, . . . 3.n using the communication links K. The applications 10 can use an integration layer 11 which connects representative services 12, 13, 14 to the client, which are known as proxies, to communicate with the distributed installations 3.1, 3.2, . . . 3.n. The client proxies 12, 13, 14 are loaded from the appropriate web servers 2.1, 2.2 . . . 2.n of the distributed installations 3.1, 3.2, . . . 3.n and provide the communication link K between the client 1 and the web servers 2.1, 2.2 . . . 2.n of the installations 3.1, 3.2, . . . 3.n.

Claim 1 recites a system for web-based monitoring and control, comprising, *inter alia*,

> the integration layer which communicates via communication links with the web servers in the respective distributed installations to obtain the data/information interchanged with the distributed installations, integrates the data/information interchanged with the distributed installations, and provides the integrated data/information to one or more of the applications for displaying; and
>
> a proxy component which, upon execution, provides for communication by the web servers in the distributed installations, said proxy component communicating with the integration layer and the web servers in the distributed installations wherein the distributed installations store data structures with references, where the references contain pointers to data structures and/or substructures in further distributed installations.

The Office Action appears to assert that in Crater, applets and components using java or ActiveX controls respectively correspond to Applicants' claimed "integration layer" and Applicants' claimed "proxy component". See Office Action: page 9, the first two paragraphs. Applicants respectfully disagree because if Crater's "applet" is construed to correspond to Applicant's claimed "integration layer", then Crater's components which use Java or ActiveX controls can not be considered to perform the functions of "proxy component".

The Office Action asserts that the components using ActiveX in Crater correspond to Applicant's claimed proxy component. The Examiner emphasizes this point in the "Response to Arguments" on pages 8 and 9 of the Office Action, where column 10, lines 8-22 and col. 6, lines 50-65 are relied upon as allegedly disclosing Applicants' claimed "proxy component." In Crater, each page of a cluster of controllers can contain instructions to access the other pages via a viewer, and an applet can be configured to present data from the entire cluster. See Crater: col. 9, lines 20-41. Crater discloses that applets can be Java-encoded, and that ActiveX controls can be an alternative to Java. See Crater: col. 6, lines 54-66. Therefore, in

Crater, the components using Java or ActiveX controls are merely applets themselves or alternative of applets. Crater does NOT disclose that components using ActiveX controls communicate with applets, which the Examiner alleges to correspond to Applicants' claimed integration layer.

Therefore, Crater does not disclose a system for web-based monitoring and control, comprising, a proxy component which, upon execution, provides for communication by the web servers in the distributed installations, said proxy component communicating with the integration layer and the web servers in the distributed installations wherein the distributed installations store data structures with references, as recited in claim 1.

Fleischman is relied upon as allegedly teaching a method for terminating a query before a pointer loopback condition ensues. Fleischman does not remedy the deficiencies of Crater, as discussed herein with respect to Applicants' claim 1. Neither does the Examiner contend that Fleischman remedies the above deficiencies of Crater.

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 is patentable. Claims 11 and 23 are patentable at least because they include distinguishing features similar to those of claim 1. The remaining claims are patentable at least because of their dependencies from the independent claims already discussed.

## CONCLUSION

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested and such action is earnestly solicited.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned so that prosecution of present application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: January 13, 2010

By: Weiwei Y. Stiltner
Registration No. 62,979

*for* Patrick C. Keane
Registration No. 32858

**Customer No. 21839**
703 836 6620